

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please substitute FIG. 6B with new FIG. 6B as illustrated in the attached replacement drawing sheet. FIG. 6B has been changed by adding a pattern inside box 600 that more clearly illustrates the fill property which was previously indicated in FIG. 6B as gray shading.

## REMARKS

### I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated February 9, 2005, claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 22, 23, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 37, 38, 40, 43, 44, and 45 have been amended. Claims 1-45 remain in the application. Re-examination and re-consideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

### II. Drawing Objections

FIG. 6B was objected to for failing to show the fill property of rectangle 600. A replacement drawing sheet is attached hereto that shows the fill property using a pattern. Such a fill property was previously illustrated in FIG. 6B through the use of gray shading within box 600.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request removal of the drawing objections.

### III. MS Windows User's Guide Reference

The rejection relies on MS Windows User's Guide Ver. 3.X by Microsoft Corporation. PTO Form 892 indicates that pages 8, 18, 27, 142, and 160 were reviewed. As provided to Applicant, the reference includes pages 8, 9, 18, 19, 26, 27, 142, and 158. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request citation in PTO Form 892 of pages 9, 19, 26, and 158. Additionally, Applicants respectfully request a copy of page 160 that was cited in the Form 892.

### IV. Prior Art Rejections

In paragraph (1) of the Office Action, claims 1-6, 8-11, 16-21, 23-26, 31-36, and 38-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by MS Windows User's Guide Ver. 3.X by Microsoft Corporation (MS). In paragraph (3) of the Office Action, claims 7, 13, 14, 22, 28, 29, 37, 43, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Windows 95 Secrets 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition to Livingston and Straub (Windows). In paragraph (4) of the Office Action, claims 15, 30, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Frank et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,651,107 (Frank). In paragraph (5) of the Office Action, claims 12, 17, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over MS in view of Windows.

Specifically, the independent claims were rejected as follows:

Microsoft Windows is a computer program that runs on a computer system. Within the Windows program, one may display windows, which may be thought of as a graphic object, that contains buttons placed on the border of the windows that when pressed, will manipulate the window. As an example, referring to the figure on page 8 in the Windows Fundamental section, by using a mouse (claim 2, 17, 32), you can click the Maximize button to enlarge the window (claim 1, 3, 16, 18, 31, and 33) [Section: Windows Fundamental, page 9]. The Control-menu button positioned in the upper left hand corner of the window as shown in the figure, may be pressed to produce a menu that allows the user to select a finite number of actions that will alter the appearance of the window, such as resize, maximize, or minimize (claim 5, 20, 35) [Section: Windows Fundamental, page 8].

...  
In reference to claims 8, 9, 23, 24, 38, and 39, buttons to manipulate the window reside in the window's border. This border width maybe changed which also alters the buttons sizes in order to ease in appearance if it's difficult to view (claims 8, 23, 38) [Section: Windows Fundamental, page 158]. As an example, if a window has been maximized, you must restore it to its original size before you can use the Minimize button to reduce it to an icon. The Minimize button does not appear in a maximized window (claims 9, 24, 39) [Section: Windows Fundamental, page 26].

In regards to claims 10, 11, 25, 26, 40, and 41, within the Windows program, one may display windows that contain buttons placed on the border. As shown in the figure on page 8 in the Windows Fundamental section, the Control-menu button positioned in the upper left-hand corner of the window produces a menu when pressed via the mouse button (claims 11, 26, 41), furnishing a finite set of manipulation options for the window, such as resize, maximize, or minimize [Section: Windows Fundamental, page 8].

In regards to claims 14, 29, and 44, illustrated in Figure 8-5, a maximize button as previously described, is illustrated as an enlarged window [Livingston et al.: page 151]. When this button is pressed, the window enlarges with respect to the screen.

Within the Windows 95 program, one may display windows, which may be thought of as a graphic object, that contains buttons placed on the border of the windows that when pressed, will manipulate window. Referring to Table 24-1 on page 614, Livingston et al. describes different pointers for different functions. With the Unavailable pointer, the cursor appears to remind you of an unaccepted action [page 614]. This may extend to attempting an unknown error when interacting with a button (claims 13, 28, and 43).

In reference to claims 7, 22, 37, the color of the buttons may be altered [page 560]. Thus, the examples mentioned previously may extend to this situation that the buttons, when pressed, will perform the corresponding operation.

Claims 15, 30, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,651,107 to Frank et al. Frank et al. discloses a CPU coupled to a display for displaying graphic and other data in multiple overlapping windows. Referring to Fig. 10, windows 255 and 260 are displayed in display 250. Window selection buttons 280, 281, 282, and 283 are shown on the four corners of window 255. Similarly, buttons 285, 286, 287, and 288 are shown on window 260. These buttons may be thought of as object manipulators. As shown, the windows are transparent, allow a user to see the graphic object behind a button [column 9m, lines 60-656; column 10, lines 1-25].

Applicants traverse the above rejections for one or more of the following reasons:

- (1) MS, Windows, and Frank do not teach, disclose or suggest a computer graphics drawing program;

(2) MS, Windows, and Frank do not teach, disclose or suggest the use of a button object manipulator in a computer graphics drawing program environment;

(3) MS, Windows, and Frank do not teach, disclose or suggest a graphic object comprised of one or more graphical elements in a computer graphics drawing program; and

(4) MS, Windows, and Frank do not teach, disclose or suggest a button object manipulator comprised of a grip.

Independent claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 13-16, 22, 23, 25, 28, 29-31, 37, 38, 40, and 43-45, and are generally directed to the use of button object manipulators in a computer graphics drawing program. In this regard, the graphics objects now comprise one or more graphical elements. Further the button object manipulators in all of the independent claims are made up of a grip. Thus, the independent claims now provide for a use in a drawing program environment with graphical elements in the drawing program. Each of the independent claims provides for different methods/mechanisms for using the button object manipulators in the drawing program.

Claims 1, 16, and 31 provide for using the button object manipulator to directly modify a property of the graphic object.

Claims 7, 22, and 37 provide for the use of colors on the object manipulator that indicates whether activation of the manipulator will affect properties of another object.

Claims 8, 23, and 38 provide for reorienting an object manipulator when the initial orientation of the manipulator is visually confusing or indistinct.

Claims 10, 25, and 40 provide for different function states of an object manipulator. Each of the function states enable the object manipulator to perform different discrete functions that modify properties of a graphic object.

Claims 13, 28, and 43 provide for displaying a bitmap image at a cursor position if the cursor position will result in an error when interacting with the object manipulator.

Claims 14, 29, and 44 provide that a particular glyph shape of the object manipulator indicates an alignment of the object with respect to additional objects.

Claims 15, 30, and 45 provide that the object manipulator is displayed in a translucent color such that the graphic object is visible behind the object manipulator.

Applicants note that all of the independent claims have been amended to occur within a computer graphics drawing program and have graphics objects that are graphical elements. Further,

the object manipulators are all comprised of grips. Such a computer drawing program environment provides unique, novel, and non-obvious capabilities.

The claims were rejected on three separate references – MS Windows User's Guide Ver. 3.X by Microsoft Corporation, Windows 95 Secrets 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, and Frank (US Patent No. 5,651,107). Applicants note that none of these references even remotely address computer graphics drawing programs. Further, none of the cited references refer to or utilize a grip. Instead, MS Windows User's Guide Ver. 3.X merely describes windows and not object manipulators, button object manipulators, or grips, in a computer graphics drawing program. Similarly, Windows 95 Secrets 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition merely describes windows and buttons in an operating system without any suggestion, implicit or explicit to a computer graphics drawing program. Lastly, Frank merely describes the use of transparent windows without any reference or teaching of a computer graphics drawing program. In addition, none of the cited references address the use of grips as claimed.

The Office Action provides that the display window in the references may be thought of as a graphic object. Applicants submit that the amended claims clearly differentiate a Windows program window with a graphics drawing program and an object manipulator. In addition, the claims now provide that the graphics object comprises one or more graphical elements. Such graphical elements in a drawing program provide a specificity that is absent with respect to the minimize/maximize buttons (or buttons in the border of a window) relied upon in the cited references.

Moreover, the various elements of Applicants' claimed invention together provide operational advantages over MS, Windows, and Frank. In addition, Applicants' invention solves problems not recognized by MS, Windows, and Frank.

Thus, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 13-16, 22, 23, 25, 28-31, 37, 38, 40, and 43-45 are allowable over MS, Windows, and Frank. Further, dependent claims 2-6, 9, 11-12, 17-21, 24, 26-27, 32-36, 39, and 41-42 are submitted to be allowable over MS, Windows, and Frank in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 13-16, 22, 23, 25, 28, 29-31, 37, 38, 40, and 43-45, respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 2-6, 9, 11-12, 17-21, 24, 26-27, 32-36, 39, and 41-42 recite additional novel elements not shown by MS, Windows, and Frank.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GATES & COOPER LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Howard Hughes Center  
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050  
Los Angeles, California 90045  
(310) 641-8797

Date: 5/9/05

By: Jason S. Feldman  
Name: Jason S. Feldman  
Reg. No.: 39,187

JSF/bjs